

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 15361) granting an increase of pension to Rhoda Workman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 15362) granting a pension to Jennie Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OLNEY: A bill (H. R. 15363) for the relief of the owner of the schooner *Itasca* and her master and crew; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE: A bill (H. R. 15364) granting an increase of pension to Julia P. Overacker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: A bill (H. R. 15365) granting a pension to Emily T. Minkler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15366) granting an increase of pension to George Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15367) granting an increase of pension to George R. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15368) granting a pension to Joseph D. Blackwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RHODES: A bill (H. R. 15369) for the relief of Monroe Gann; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 15370) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 15371) granting a pension to Andrew J. Shell; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4692. By Mr. BLAND of Missouri: Petition of numerous citizens of Missouri, advocating enactment of Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4693. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Missouri, advocating and urging enactment of Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4694. By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of August G. Wegener and 487 others, protesting against presence and conduct of colored French troops in the occupied German territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4695. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of Roy B. Lyons, secretary, on behalf of Washington Grange, No. 1655, Washington, Mich., asking for the enactment of the French-Copper fabric bill (H. R. 11641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4696. Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Dodge, of Cass City, Mich., and others, asking for the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4697. Also, petition of John Doepker, of Pigeon, Mich., and others, protesting against the presence of uncivilized colored soldiers of the French Republic in the occupied districts of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4698. Also, petition of Lapeer Home Circle, of Lapeer, Mich., asking that the water-power act be amended so as not to apply to national parks and monuments, also for the defeat of the Fall's River Basin bill; to the Select Committee on Water Power.

4699. Also, petition of E. H. Scott, of Armada, Mich., and others, for an amendment to the United States Constitution which shall grant and guarantee the rights and privileges of citizenship to the members of the race of American Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

4700. By Mr. DARROW: Petition of the Philadelphia Bourse, in behalf of simplification in the matter of tax returns by individuals, firms, and corporations; also the Philadelphia Board of Trade, recommending that internal-revenue laws be so framed as to be simple in form and free from complex regulations as to filing reports or making statistical statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4701. By Mr. DOUGHTON: Petition of the Woman's Club of Albemarle, N. C., indorsing the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4702. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Kankakee Chamber of Commerce, of Kankakee, Ill., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4703. Also, petition of 90 ladies of the Dekalb, Ill., Women's Club, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bills, S. 3259 and H. R. 10925; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4704. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of Homer L. Boyle, of Lansing, Mich., requesting legislation authorizing the President to call an international conference to relieve suffer-

ing caused by existing famines, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4705. By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Neville Island Civic Club, of Coraopolis, Pa., urging the immediate passage of the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4706. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of American citizens of Boston, Mass., against the interference by America in Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4707. By Mr. YATES: Petition of the Kane County Farm Bureau, by W. B. Richards, farm adviser, urging the passage of the French-Copper truth in fabric bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4708. Also, petition of the Railway Mail Association of Washington, D. C., by Mr. W. M. Collins, industrial secretary, urging the removal of the pledge of secrecy exacted of the railway postal clerks in connection with compensation and classification for the employees of the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4709. Also, petition of E. B. Leigh, president Chicago Railway Equipment Co., of Chicago; the Haddorff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill.; and the W. F. Hall Printing Co., all favoring the early passage of House bill 11984, the Nolan Patent Office force and salaries bill; to the Committee on Patents.

4710. Also, petition of the Hollywood Woman's Club, of Hollywood; the Suburban Civics Club, of Oak Park, by Mrs. J. H. Lee; Anna L. Fries, of Chicago; O. H. Call, of Princeton; and E. A. Elmenstrom, of Chicago, all of the State of Illinois, protesting against House bill 12466 and the water power act; to the Select Committee on Water Power.

4711. Also, petition of Hon. William L. Gleason, mayor of the city of Brockton, Mass., and the president of the board of aldermen and of the common council with reference to certain legislation regarding the fixing of the price of coal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4712. Also, petition of A. L. Castle, president of the Channon-Emery Stove Co., of Quincy, Ill., urging the passage of legislation providing 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4713. Also, petition of the Vermilion County League of Women Voters, by Mrs. Charles W. Fleming, of Danville; the Child Welfare Association, of Danville; and the Hollywood Woman's Club, of Hollywood, all of the State of Illinois, favoring the passage of the Sheppard-Towner bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, December 27, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we would not be true to the trusts that have been committed to us if we undertook the duties of a new day in our own self-sufficiency or if we did less than invoke Thy blessing upon the labor of our hands and hearts. We look to Thee, the guide of all men, the judge of all men, and yet we have been taught to call Thee our Father and know that Thou hast an infinite interest in all that pertains to the welfare of our children. Grant us such measure of grace to-day as that we may do the things that are pleasing in Thy sight to forward the cause that is nearest to Thy heart, the cause of peace and justice and righteousness in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

#### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1920.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CHARLES CURTIS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair this legislative day.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. CURTIS thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

#### THE JOURNAL.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. KING and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested:

H. R. 15344. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 15196. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of the soldiers and sailors of said war.

## PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LENROOT. I shall have to object.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is any objection, I shall not insist upon the motion; I withdraw it.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection, and the Senator from Utah withdraws the motion.

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 15344. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 15196. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of these soldiers and sailors of said war, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

## CREDENTIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of the State of Washington, certifying to the election of WESLEY L. JONES as a Senator from that State for the term of six years, beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON.  
Office of Governor, Olympia.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 2d day of November, 1920, WESLEY L. JONES was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Washington a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1921.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed at Olympia this 10th day of December, A. D. 1920, and of our State the thirty-second year.

[SEAL.]

LOUIS F. HART,  
Acting Governor of Washington.

By the Acting Governor:

W. J. KINGSLEY,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a certificate of the governor of the State of Kentucky, certifying to the election of RICHARD P. ERNST as a Senator from that State for the term of six years, beginning March 4, 1921, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

I, Edwin P. Morrow, governor of State of Kentucky, do certify that Roy Speck, William Heyburn, and James H. Polsgrove constitute the board of election commissioners of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and as such commissioners are duly empowered by the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to execute and deliver the attached certificate of election.

In testimony whereof I have caused to be affixed hereto the seal of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

[SEAL.]

EDWIN P. MORROW,  
Governor of State of Kentucky.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,  
Frankfort, Ky., November 22, 1920.

The undersigned, a board for examining returns of an election held on Tuesday, the 2d day of November, 1920, for United States Senator of the State of Kentucky, do certify that Hon. RICHARD P. ERNST received the highest number of votes given for that office, as certified by the secretary of state, and is therefore duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

ROY SPECK, Chairman,  
JAMES M. POLSGROVE, Member,  
WM. HEYBURN, Member,  
State Board of Election Commissioners  
for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:

Mrs. T. H. VANZANT,  
Secretary State Board of Election Commissioners.

## PETITIONS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of members of the Onondaga Nation and the Tonawanda Band of the Seneca Nation of Indians, of New York, praying for an amendment of House bill

288 exempting them from its provisions, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. KENDRICK presented a letter from the Alfalfa Commercial Club, of Washakie County, Wyo., favoring tariff legislation on wool, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Carbon County Wool Growers' Association, of Carbon County, Wyo., favoring the so-called French-Capper truth in fabric bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENDRICK. I present a resolution adopted by the Council of Industry, the Rotary Club, and the Lions Club, of Laramie, Wyo., favoring the Chamberlain highway bill. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

## COURTS IN CONNECTICUT.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 4682) to amend section 74 of the Judicial Code as amended, and I ask for its present consideration.

I will state for the information of the Senate that the bill simply provides an additional day for holding the district court in my State at Norwalk, in addition to the regular terms at Hartford and New Haven. In other respects the present law stands exactly as it is. That is the effect of the bill, and I ask that it be read.

The bill was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 74 of the Judicial Code as amended be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 74. The State of Connecticut shall constitute one judicial district, to be known as the district of Connecticut. Terms of the district court shall be held at New Haven on the fourth Tuesdays in February and September, at Hartford on the fourth Tuesday in May and the first Tuesday in December, and at Norwalk on the fourth Tuesday in April: *Provided, however,* That suitable rooms and accommodations shall be furnished for the holdings of said court and for the use of the officers of said court at Norwalk free of expense to the Government of the United States."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4723) granting an increase of pension to David Granger (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX (for Mr. PENROSE):

A bill (S. 4724) for the relief of Cornelius Dugan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A bill (S. 4725) authorizing the President to dispose of certain arms and ammunition seized in pursuance of the act approved June 17, 1917, along the Mexican border; and

A bill (S. 4726) authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the Bush Terminal Railroad Co. and the Long Island Railroad, for restricted use, the tracks of the Government railroad on the Army supply base at South Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4727) granting a pension to Charles F. Smith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 4728) for the relief of J. S. Van Doren (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 4729) to amend section 7 of the act approved December 23, 1913, and known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act of March 3, 1919; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 4730) granting certain abandoned military reservations to the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 4731) authorizing the lease of school lands containing deposits of coal, oil, oil shale, or gas by the State of Washington for longer periods than five years; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) to extend the time for filing applications for relief under the river and harbor act approved March 2, 1919; to the Committee on Commerce.



By Mr. WADSWORTH:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 232) permitting Chinese to register under certain provisions and conditions; to the Committee on Immigration.

#### AMENDMENT TO APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

At the proper place insert: "Seattle, Wash., Passport Bureau: For salaries and expenses of maintenance of the passport bureau, \$7,500."

#### SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. KNOX. I report a resolution from the Committee on Rules and ask for its present consideration. It is the usual resolution passed at this time of the year.

The resolution (S. Res. 411) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,500 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 300 copies shall be bound in full cowhide and tagged as to contents.

#### COST OF RAILROAD FUEL.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 412), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to ascertain forthwith and report to the Senate the increased cost of railroad fuel to the railroads of the United States for the current year over the cost of the same to them for the year 1919, and to furnish in detail a statement of the tonnage of railroad fuel this year, its total cost, its average cost per ton, and the average cost per ton of last year's railroad fuel, to the end that the difference in cost between the two years may plainly appear.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill for a second reading.

The bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the bill is now ready for reference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce. In support of that motion, I draw attention to the fact that it is a bill whose purpose it is to impose an embargo upon the commerce of imports to the United States from other countries. It is not a bill to raise revenue. Its chief purpose, according to all the discussion, is a bill to regulate the commerce of the United States by erecting tariff barriers against the importation of certain commodities. Under those circumstances it seems to me evident that its proper reference is to the Committee on Commerce and not to the Committee on Finance.

Of course, on the merits of the question I hold very strong views. It seems to me that at this time of all others the country ought not to raise tariff barriers against doing business with any nation in the world. What we need above all other things at this time is to do business with the other countries. We have enormous exportable surpluses in the country. This year our exports will amount to \$3,000,000,000 more than our imports.

Our exports can only be paid for in cash or credits or products. It is obvious that they can not be paid for in cash, because we have such a large percentage of the gold of the world that practically speaking no other country in the world can send us any gold. Each of the other countries has impounded all the gold that it has and is clinging desperately to it. There are only two other ways in which the other countries can purchase our products from us. One is by credits and the other is by selling products to us.

We have reached a point where we all realize that credit is approaching exhaustion. During the present year we have sold to the other countries something like \$3,000,000,000 on credit, and during 1919 we sold to the other countries \$3,000,000,000 on credit. That credit is largely obtained in our banking institutions, and that credit is largely responsible for so exhausting the credit facilities of our banks that our own people have not been able to find adequate credit.

We out in the agricultural regions realize fully the serious need of credit. Our farmers who raise wheat and corn and hogs and cattle have not been able to secure enough credit; and so in the South those who raise cotton and other products

have not been able to secure enough credit, and have been compelled to dump their products upon the markets simultaneously, which has resulted in ruinous prices for them.

Now, in this situation, Mr. President, should we erect tariff barriers to prevent the other countries from selling us their products which will go to pay for the things that we ought to export? We have become a creditor Nation to an enormous extent, and we can not afford to erect these tariff barriers against all the rest of the world because we must, if we maintain any degree of prosperity, have a market for our great exportable surplus.

In view of the situation, it seems to me a shocking proposition to bring a bill of this sort into Congress, which proposes to erect great tariff barriers against our best customers and to rush that bill through Congress without a hearing, practically, almost without a meeting of the committees constituted for the purpose of considering such matters.

The bill that passed the House, as is well known, received very inadequate consideration, almost no hearings at all before the great committees. Here in the Senate the machinery is already set to rush the bill through without any hearings whatever, just upon somebody's assumption that the thing to do to bring relief to the agriculturists of the West is to erect tariff barriers against the rest of the world, tariff barriers which must inevitably interfere with the opportunity of the West to sell their products to the rest of the world.

In view of this situation, it seems to me the bill should go to the committee which has in charge the consideration of the commerce of the United States.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In a moment I will very gladly yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to ask a question upon the subject the Senator is discussing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to ask what products we are sending to Australia in any way to offset the enormous quantity of wool that is coming in from Australia? What are we turning over to Canada in the way of agricultural products to offset the immense quantity of grain that is coming from Canada and which, as the Senator himself has said, we must export? The Senator spoke of the Canadians being our best customers. Certainly he can not say that Australia purchases a great deal from the United States.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a very fair question; it is a question which the committee should consider and consider carefully; but the Senator from North Dakota is well aware that the trade of the world is not arranged on the basis of selling to any particular country an exact balance of what we buy from any particular country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator fear that the committee will not give the matter adequate consideration?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, judging by what has already happened and the disposition that has been shown and the reports which are current, I understood that this bill was to be rushed through as an emergency measure and to have little, if any, consideration.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think the Senator is drawing conclusions that are not at all warranted. The matter has not come before the committee. I am certain that it will receive adequate consideration by the committee. I do not think the Senator will seriously contend that being a tariff bill, even though it might stop importations in some instances, still it should go to the Committee on Commerce any more than any other tariff bill should go to that committee.

I desired to allay the Senator's fear that the measure would not have fair consideration, and if the Senator will allow me, I wish to tell him exactly what protection, for instance, there is on wheat under the House proposal, in order that he may see that it would not be a very big economic barrier, when the difference of exchange is taken into consideration.

Wheat from Canada, say from Winnipeg, is at present, or was the other day, selling for \$1.85 per bushel in Canadian currency, while it was \$1.84 per bushel in Chicago at the same time. The difference between the exchange would average about 15 per cent. The 15 per cent would be equivalent to 27½ cents. Now, subtract the 27½ cents from 30 cents per bushel—which the tariff would average per bushel, as the House measure provides—and it would give the American producer just 3½ cents per bushel protection. We lived through the 30 per cent protection, and we got considerable imports. Even that 3½ cents protection per bushel is more than met by the difference between Canadian No. 1 northern wheat and American No. 1 northern, the Canadian requirement being higher than is the requirement for the same grade in the United States, which

would make an equivalent for milling purposes, I should estimate, of about 7 or 8 cents per bushel. So when we take these matters into consideration, and also the exchange, with the 3 or 4 cents protection, the American farmer would still hardly be on an even basis with the Canadian farmer.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota and I disagree radically. The idea of protecting the growers of American wheat is either a delusion and a snare or it is a confidence game; it is a gold brick given to them. Our wheat is sold upon the markets of the world, and if we do not meet Canadian wheat in our market we shall meet Canadian wheat in the places to which we export our surplus wheat. It is that export surplus which fixes the price of wheat. This country has raised seven or eight hundred million bushels of wheat—perhaps more—and it has an exportable surplus; it is exporting that surplus, and if the Canadian wheat does not meet our American wheat in Chicago it will meet it in Liverpool or in some other foreign market. The American wheat grower receives absolutely no protection whatever; and protection is not what the American wheat grower needs. What the American wheat grower needs at present is credit, and he needs with it an unfettered trade with the other nations of the world. He needs credit for his products, not only domestic but international. The American wheat grower of intelligence is not going to be deluded by the gold brick which is offered him into believing that this barrier against Canadian wheat is going to enable him to get a better price for his product.

Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota speaks of Canada. I tell him that Canada is perhaps the very best customer the United States has. To Canada every year we export \$800,000,000 worth of products, and from Canada we import only one-half that amount; and yet, while Canada is only able to send to us one-half as much as we export to her, it is proposed to erect barriers against that which she is exporting to us. Such a policy strikes me as suicidal in this emergency.

I realize that there are people who think that the proposed tariff on wheat and corn and sheep and mutton and wool is going to be of some value; but I believe it will do an infinite amount of damage to the United States at this time to begin to erect barriers so as to interfere with trade with the remainder of the world. We have become a great creditor nation; we are almost in the position in which Great Britain has been in the past; and we shall be injured by anything that interferes with our trade. We have not only loaned \$10,000,000,000 of Government money belonging to our people to the remainder of the world, upon which they already owe us an enormous balance of seven or eight hundred million dollars of interest, but our bankers and our credit concerns have, as we know, advanced to the rest of the world \$3,000,000,000 last year, with another \$3,000,000,000 this year, with which to pay for the balance of trade. Now it is proposed to make that task harder and to put a still greater strain upon credit by erecting barriers against receiving their products here to help pay for those things that we ought to sell to them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me see if I understand the Senator accurately. The Senator thinks what we ought to do is to find a market for our surplus of wheat, and that we ought to direct our energies toward marketing the surplus that we now have. Is that correct?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What I say is that this country should be the last one in the world in this juncture to erect barriers against trade with the other countries—

Mr. McCUMBER. I know the Senator said that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Because we have a great exportable surplus. People in other countries of the world are starving for the wheat we are raising here; people in other parts of the world have the utmost need for the surplus cotton that is really rotting in this country at the present time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that is what the Senator said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The people of other nations of the world have urgent need for the surpluses which we have in this country, not only of wheat and cotton, but also of wool. Only a little while ago the agents of Poland were over here and seeking to buy wool in this market, which is supposed to be overstocked. They found no means by which they could secure in the United States the credit which was necessary to buy the wool. They went to Great Britain; the British Government gave those Polish representatives the credit, and the wool was purchased in Great Britain and in Australia. We should be busy, in my

opinion, in this country providing individual credit to enable foreign nations to trade with us; but at the same time we are providing that credit we should be very careful not to erect any barriers against their paying us in products.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I did not know but that the Senator had finished. If he has not, I will wait until he has concluded.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am showing, Mr. President, why I think this bill, whose name, in all honesty, should be "a bill to regulate trade and commerce with other countries," should go to the committee that has to do with and examines into matters affecting trade and commerce, and not to a committee that considers measures proposing to levy taxes. The purpose of the bill is not to raise taxes. The enactment of a bill to raise taxes has been by general agreement postponed until the next session of Congress. This bill has not that purpose; it is an embargo bill; it is devised as an embargo bill. It was concluded not to call it an embargo bill, but, in fact, it is an embargo bill. The report on the bill presented by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, as well as the views presented by the minority of that committee, show by their arguments that it is designed to check imports into this country. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the bill be referred to the proper committee, which is the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I think I have quite accurately followed the reasoning of the Senator. He says that foreign countries are starving for our wheat, and he wants to give them credit in order to help us send our wheat to them. He says the farmers in the West and Northwest want to get rid of their surplus, and in order to do so want to find a market for that surplus. That is true; I agree with that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I hope the Senator will not aim to quote me in such an inaccurate way. I said that this country needs, above everything else, the unfettered opportunity to trade with the remainder of the world and that every barrier which is erected against the importation of anything from the other nations of the world makes it difficult for us to sell our products of whatever sort they are to foreign countries.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator spoke of the necessity of finding a market and of giving credit in some way to foreign Governments or to their people in order that they may be able to purchase our products. I agree with him upon that. I voted for the bill to revive the activities of the War Finance Corporation for that purpose, and we hope that it may assist us along that line. I think that measure may do some good; but before we can get a living price for our products in foreign markets or anywhere else we have got to be able to sell them abroad; we have got to find customers; and if it is difficult for us to find a customer for the 180,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat which we have on hand to export, is not the difficulty added to if we import into the United States 150,000,000 bushels in addition to that, thus increasing the number of bushels that we must export before we can hold our price up to a living standard? That is the situation with which we are met. Mostly on account of the difference in the exchange, we are receiving the entire Canadian surplus of wheat, which amounts to very close to 200,000,000 bushels. At the same time we are attempting to find a market for our surplus, so that it may be sold.

I have before me a letter from a man in my State who operates a large farm and who, of course, has to hire considerable labor. He tells me that the actual cost of raising his wheat this year was about \$2.50 a bushel. The market price is \$1.17 a bushel at the place where he lives. Of course, he is desirous of breaking even if possible. We do not object so seriously that the farmer should be made the "goat" in all instances, but we object to bearing so heavily upon him that he can not operate his farm at all. We want a little assistance; we want to close the opening of the top of the barrel while we are attempting to draw off a little of the surplus at the spigot. If all the Canadian grain is to come into the United States—I mean all, of course, that is for export—we have increased our responsibility and our export liability.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska says that the provisions of this bill amount to a prohibition, to an embargo. The House bill, however, does not amount to anything, so far as wheat is concerned, for it would be practically of little or no value to the wheat farmer. I understood that in the House the bill would provide a tariff of 50 cents per bushel, or 25



cents per bushel with the rate of exchange taken into consideration, which would bring it up to about in the neighborhood of 50 cents a bushel. As a matter of fact, as I have shown you, we would receive under the House bill a protection, if you call it a protection, of about 3½ cents per bushel after making allowance for the difference in exchange. The Canadian wheat would come over just exactly the same. It would pay its small duty, and the Canadian farmer could still undersell the American farmer.

In my State, and in the entire northwest section of the country, all the way from eastern Montana to western Minnesota, which takes in the Red River Valley, I do not think we have more than a quarter of an average crop. Senators can easily understand, then, the extreme hardship in those sections of the country. When they have had to hire labor at excessively high wages, when the thrashing bill itself amounted to more than 30 cents a bushel, Senators can see how difficult it is for the farmers even to live through the winter. They are attempting to hold their grain until they can secure somewhat better prices; but with the Canadian crop coming in and supplying the deficiency, the withholding of their grain from market at the present time is giving them no benefit whatever. The price is still low.

Mr. President, while I could not under any circumstances vote for this bill as it comes over from the House, I hope it will be referred to the committee to which it properly belongs, receive proper consideration in the committee, and that at some time after our reassembling in January it may have full and fair consideration before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HATCHER] that this is an embargo bill. This bill will not prevent the importation of wheat nor other items mentioned in the bill. It is a revenue bill, pure and simple.

Take the item of wool alone: To-day wool comes into this country free. Under this bill we impose a duty of 15 cents a pound on it. There is no question but a limited amount of wool will come into the country with a rate of duty of 15 cents a pound, and will yield a revenue, so the bill is a revenue measure. I might add other items in the bill as to which exactly the same thing is true. It is not an embargo bill in any sense of the word. There will be revenue derived from it; and as far as referring the bill to the Committee on Commerce is concerned, I do not think the motion is made in good faith.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. I notice in this bill that unwashed wool carries a duty of 15 cents a pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. What was the tariff on unwashed wool in the Payne-Aldrich bill? I am sure the Senator remembers.

Mr. SMOOT. Eleven cents a pound.

Mr. HARRISON. In this bill washed wool has a duty of 30 cents a pound. What was it in the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Twenty-two cents.

Mr. HARRISON. And the duty on scoured wool in this bill is 45 cents a pound, with a compensatory duty of 45 cents a pound in addition to existing duties on the manufactures of wool. What was that in the Payne-Aldrich bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Thirty-three cents a pound. The duties carried by this bill are in the same proportion, as between wool in the grease, washed wool, and scoured wool, as the duties which the Payne-Aldrich bill provided; but I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that a duty of 15 cents a pound will not keep foreign wools out of the United States, but will at least limit their importation.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask these questions merely to show that this bill in every instance carries a larger tariff than was carried in the Payne-Aldrich bill, which the leaders of the Senator's own party condemned, and said was infamous.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, this is a temporary measure. There never was a condition in the United States such as exists to-day with regard to most of the items enumerated in this bill.

Take wool, for instance, to which the Senator has referred. If there were not another pound of wool imported into the United States for two years, if there were not a pound of wool clipped from an American sheep for the next two years, there is enough wool in the United States to run the mills of the country for that time, with the exception of a line of very fine wools that come from Australia.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. If there is enough wool in this country to last for two years, what good would it do to stop the wool from coming in?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as long as the foreigner can get American dollars for their wool, there will be enough sent in here to last us for three years, unless there is some kind of a temporary duty imposed upon wool. There is to-day over 20,000,000 pounds of wool on the way to our ports and will arrive just as quickly as the boats can land it here.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, if there is two years' supply held in this country now, will the Senator tell us how keeping other wool from coming in at this time is going to help the woolgrower until that two years' supply is used up?

Mr. SMOOT. Why, Mr. President, it certainly will help the woolgrower with regard to next year's crop. It certainly will stabilize the market here to-day, and it certainly will give the American woolgrower a chance to sell his wool in competition with wools that hereafter will come into this country. I want to say to the Senator, too, that if there is a duty placed upon the wools that are coming in here now, the price of those wools will be higher. I do not want to deny it. I want to say frankly that that will be the case.

Mr. REED. So that it will raise the price of wool?

Mr. SMOOT. It certainly will.

Mr. REED. And who will pay that increase?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if the ultimate consumer pays only the amount of duty that the bill imposes upon wool, he will never feel it. I will take, for instance, the suit of clothes which the Senator has on. How much wool does he think is in it, and what does the 15 cents a pound duty enhance the price of the suit?

Mr. REED. This suit I got before the war, so I think it has some wool in it; but I think any suit of clothes bought now has very little wool in it. There ought to be some put into it.

Mr. SMOOT. So little, I was going to say, that it will amount to nothing. If you want to get at the cost to the consumer, you will have to find it from some other source than the producer of the wool, at the price at which wool is imported into the United States to-day. I saw an account only yesterday of quarter-bloods of South American wool being sold for 9 cents a pound. On that basis there is not a suit of clothes worn by a man in this Chamber the wool in which will cost more than 90 cents.

The Senator from Nebraska is very much worried over the matter of credits in connection with the exportation of wheat, and says the importation ought to offset our exportation of goods. Let us look at the situation just as it is. Why can not Canada finance her exportations of wheat and not have our market to sell in for cash? What country is there, outside of America, that can extend credits to foreign countries to purchase large quantities of wheat? As long as we are allowing Canada to ship her wheat into the United States, and receive our dollars for it, she is not compelled to extend or worry about credit in any foreign country.

The Senator refers to the question of Poland and England in connection with wool transactions. America did not sell her the wool, he says, because of the fact that she did not arrange a credit. England arranged the credit, and yet England owes us to-day more money than was ever paid by Poland for wool in the interest upon her obligations to the United States. How did she arrange the credit for Poland? Just the same as the United States would have had to arrange it. America did not arrange the credit, but England did. If, however, England had paid us the interest she was owing on her obligations to us, perhaps we could have extended credit without increasing our inflated currency.

Mr. President, it is not a question of making a tariff bill for the future; it is a question as to whether we want to save the industries mentioned in the bill from immediate ruin in many cases. No tariff act that can be passed is going to save half of the sheepmen of this country, because they are ruined to-day. Nothing can save them; but if a measure can be passed here that will at least give confidence to the men that have advanced the grower the money, to carry them on from year to year, so that they can sell a part of their product, it ought to be done; and that is all that this bill can do, if it does that.

Mr. President, as far as the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce, I take it for granted that there is not a Senator here who thinks this is a proper bill to go to that committee. It is

a bill that should go to the Finance Committee, and I have not any doubt but that it will go there.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator is an expert on this subject. May I ask the Senator if he is in favor of placing frozen meats in this bill?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly I am in favor of it; and if the Senator would go into the cold-storage plants of the United States, and see the hundreds of thousands of carcasses, if not millions of them, shipped from foreign countries, held in cold storage to-day, I think he would be in favor of it.

Mr. HARRISON. I want to say to the Senator that I am gratified to know that he is, because his party at the other end of the Capitol were not, and they did not place them in this bill, although an amendment was offered to that effect; and I shall be very much in favor of putting such a proposition in the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the Senator from Mississippi will be in favor of putting anything in this bill in order to secure its defeat.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; I am perfectly open about that proposition. I am very much opposed to the bill.

Mr. GERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Utah a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Ohio for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. GERRY. I do.

Mr. POMERENE. The other day the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] discussed very interestingly and very instructively the high price which he had to pay a few days ago for meat.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. Which was certainly a very exorbitant price. If the Senator had to pay that price for meat, there are a good many who would have to go without meat in this country, who could not afford to pay it. In view of that fact, does the Senator still think that there should be a tariff duty on meats?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. Mr. President, the question of the cost of meat to the retailer is another proposition. The profits are made in the sale by the retailer to the consumer.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to make a point of order that this question is not debatable, and I cite this ruling of the Vice President, to be found on page 173 of Volume II of Gilfry's Precedents of the Senate:

During the morning hour Mr. NORRIS moved to refer a communication from the Attorney General to the Committee on the Judiciary.

It was a motion to refer a matter to a committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT (MR. MARSHALL). The Chair holds that during the morning hour the motion is not debatable.

I submit, Mr. President, in support of that that the entire spirit of Rule VII and Rule VIII, covering the consideration of business during the morning hour, is that it shall be disposed of without debate.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I desire to address myself to the proposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will listen to the Senator from Mississippi on the point of order for a moment.

Mr. HARRISON. Must a Senator address himself to the point of order, or to the subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To the point of order.

Mr. HARRISON. I understood that the morning business was closed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not closed. On the point of order raised by the Senator from Washington the Chair will state that during a ruling of the Chair March 28, 1914, the following occurred:

The VICE PRESIDENT. In this connection the Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair was in error in ruling that the question of the reference of a bill to a committee is not debatable. The Chair was under the impression that the question was one of those questions which, under Rule XXII, are not debatable; but the Chair finds that the question is debatable. Therefore the ruling of the Chair heretofore made in reference to the matter will not stand as a precedent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does that apply to a motion made during the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I hope that, no matter what committee this bill shall be referred to, full hearings will be held upon it. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I learn that the bill was introduced in the House with practically no hearings, except some statements from wool and cattle men relating to the bad condition of those industries. The Tariff Commission was not heard, and apparently the committee did not call for reports from it.

When the bill came into the House a cloture rule was placed on it, and it was passed with very limited debate, with the result that many Members were only able to express their views on it subsequent to the passage of the bill, by being granted leave to extend their remarks in the Record. There is no question but that this bill has been very hurriedly conceived and then rushed through the lower House on the ground that it is an emergency measure.

Mr. President, I do not believe that it is wise in any respect to try to remedy economic conditions by putting through ill-considered measures. They are much more apt to create greater harm than they can ever remedy. In fact, from the debates in the House it has been suggested that this bill was not really offered seriously, for the purpose of relieving an emergency, or even in the belief that it would become a law, but rather the suggestion was made that it was intended for political expediency, and when I read the bill over and consider it—and I have had very little time to do that—I am convinced that there must be some such reason for the introduction of such a measure.

It is impossible to write a tariff bill piecemeal. If this bill is passed, putting a new tariff on wool, putting a new tariff on wheat, putting a new tariff on cotton, cattle, and other products, the result is going to be that other schedules in the existing tariff law will have to be rewritten. Naturally an increase in the tariff on raw materials means a decrease in the tariff on the manufactures of those materials.

Mr. President, to show with what lack of system this bill was considered, some of the rates imposed in it are higher than the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and some are lower. There is a new tax on cattle and none on dairy products. There is a tax on wool, when it has already been stated in this Chamber that there is wool in storage in tremendous quantities, and a tax on the importation of sheep. The result undoubtedly will be that the men who hold the wool now in storage, who are not the farmers, will be able to reap a profit out of this bill; the profiteer will again have an advantage, and the farmer will receive no benefit.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. GERRY. In a moment. I do not believe that this tariff, passed at this time as an emergency measure, will save the sheep of the country, and if the sheep are killed off, as it has been suggested that they will be on account of the high price of food, the result will be that when the farmer wants to buy them back, with this tariff still in existence, he will have to pay more for his ewes. Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought the Senator understood that at least 85 per cent of the wool clip of last year is still owned by the woolgrower. It is held by the commission house, and I know some cases where there has been a 25 cent advance on the wool, and in such cases there has been a demand made upon the woolgrower for a return of 10 cents a pound. So whatever advantage comes will come to the woolgrower, and not to the commission man.

Mr. GERRY. I understood that a statement to that effect was made in the House and was contradicted. I do not come from a wool State, and I am unable to argue the question with the Senator from Utah. I have not the information, and I have not had time to look it up. But Members of the House who were familiar with that situation had divergent views upon it.

But it is perfectly apparent, Mr. President, that if the farmer is to be helped in this way, as I said before, there will be a reaction upon the manufacturer; there will be a reaction on the consumer in the cost of his products, and I do not think that there is any bill that has been introduced in this body that would have a worse effect on the people in my part of the country, who are suffering from the depression that has existed ever since the election. They are now suffering from lack of employment, are seeking more than ever a reduction in the high cost of living. The object of a bill of this sort is to place an embargo on certain highly important commodities.

Mr. President, I can not imagine a greater injury that could be done to the thickly populated centers, the manufacturing States, the States where the people earn their living not by the



products of the farm but through manufacture and commerce, than a bill of this sort, whose acknowledged object is to raise the price of all those basic commodities of food and clothing which are absolutely essential in order to sustain life.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GERRY. Yes; certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator speaks of its effect in raising the price of food to the people. The Senator was here the other day, I think, when there was reported to the Senate a bill with an account showing where some nearly 2,000 ewes had been shipped from Montana into the market. The condition was so bad that the ewes had to be shipped, and those ewes were first sent on to Denver, then to Omaha, and finally landed in Chicago, and after deducting the cost of shipping, including feed, the owner of those ewes got 32 cents apiece for them. If the price of the ewes had been raised so that he would have gotten even \$1 or \$1.50, does the Senator think it would have made any difference in the price he would have to pay for a mutton chop? For instance, if the farmer got for the ewe 32 cents, and the Senator pays 50 cents for a single mutton chop, does the Senator think there is any very close relation between what the farmer got and what the Senator pays in a restaurant as the price of that meat?

Mr. GERRY. I will say to the Senator that I know the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made that argument in the House when the bill was up for consideration. Naturally there are certain economic laws which govern the cost of living, and those economic laws can be set aside, and they often are set aside, by the profiteer. I personally feel that we should do everything we can to offset these conspiracies to sustain the high cost of living and to make huge profits. These conspiracies are conspiracies in restraint of trade. But I think that when we are going to do that we should not also try to complicate the situation more by putting an embargo on essential commodities, which is bound to basically raise their price.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the 50-cent per chop for mutton did not go down when the farmer got 32 cents for a whole sheep, wool and all, does the Senator think that if the farmer had even gotten a dollar or a dollar and a half for the sheep it would have increased the price of the chop that is served to him?

Mr. GERRY. I think undoubtedly that if the price of sheep continues to fall you will find that your mutton chops will go down too, although it will not probably go down immediately; but I think if you increase the cost of sheep your chances of having your mutton chop decrease in price will be very slim.

Mr. McCUMBER. If ewes are to be sold at such a price that they will not raise any more next year, so that we will depend entirely on importation, it would seem to me that the tendency would be for it to go up another year from now.

Mr. GERRY. Frankly, I will say to the Senator that I do not believe this bill will act in time to prevent the destruction of ewes, on account of the high cost of feed, especially as there is a tariff in this bill covering a great many food products which are fed to cattle and sheep.

But, Mr. President, the whole theory of this form of tariff legislation on certain products is, of course, unsound. It is doubly unsound under present world conditions, where we can only straighten out or help to remedy by barter the situation growing out of the balance of trade. It is impossible to even it up by an importation of gold, because there is not enough gold in Europe to do that, the greater measure of gold being in this country, and it therefore comes back to a question of barter—trade by the interchange of commodities.

When the bill is referred to a committee I hope, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, that the entire matter will be thrashed out very thoroughly by hearings and that then the Senate will have an opportunity to determine whether they want to take up legislation of this popgun sort.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have an article that appeared yesterday in the New York World which is extremely enlightening and illuminating, and if the Senator from Mississippi is not in any hurry to proceed I ask that the article may be printed in the Record, if the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] will consent.

Mr. SMOOT. I would rather have the Senator read it.

Mr. HARRISON. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the Record as requested.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is a newspaper article and I shall have to object to that request, but the Senator may read the article if he desires.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from Utah will remove himself from the Chamber, we can get through more quickly.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think the Senator from Mississippi is anxious to get through quickly at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield while I read the article?

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Utah if at 2 o'clock he proposes to lay aside the unfinished business to carry on the consideration of the tariff legislation? I would like to know what is the intention of the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. If we have votes enough, we certainly will do it.

Mr. HARRISON. Then I suggest the absence of a quorum to find out if we have votes enough now to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	La Follette	Pointexter
Beckham	Hale	Lenroot	Pomerene
Borah	Harrison	McCumber	Ransdell
Brandeggee	Henderson	McKellar	Reed
Capper	Hitchcock	McLean	Sheppard
Culberson	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smoot
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Stanley
Dillingham	Kellogg	Nelson	Sterling
Edge	Kendrick	New	Sutherland
Elkins	Kenyon	Norris	Townsend
Fletcher	Keyes	Nugent	Wadsworth
France	King	Page	Walsh, Mont.
Gerry	Knox	Phipps	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Jones of Washington in the chair). Fifty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hitchcock], on which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Harrison] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator from California [Mr. Johnson] that he may read the article to which reference has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for that purpose.

#### AFFAIRS IN THE NEAR EAST.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for occupying time in the reading of an article, even for a very few moments, but the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] refuses to depart from his well-established rule. I congratulate him upon that course, which is a somewhat vicarious atonement for the space he occupies in the Record.

The article that I desire to submit, illuminating and enlightening upon the Near East policy, is one with which I think all of us should be familiar, and it should be brought to the attention of the country, if it be possible. It is an article that appeared yesterday in the New York World, a hard and fast administration paper and chief advocate of the League of Nations among the newspapers of the country. The article is as follows:

HOW SUBTERFUGE AND INTRIGUE HAVE CAMOUFLAGED THE NEAR EAST POLICY OF EUROPE'S DIPLOMATS.

[By Ferdinand Tönnies.]

LONDON, December 1, 1920.

"Had the late King Alexander not had an encounter with a monkey, the Allies might have held the Balkans and the Near East for years indefinite. That a monkey bite has grievously undermined their authority from Bagdad to Odessa and from Athens to Baku is to one just returned from that part of the world a singularly vivid commentary on the chronic rottenness of the Near East policy pursued by Europe's liberators from armistice onward and crowned at Sevres, where the old and highly breakable china comes from.

"France and England may bury unknown warriors, with none so low as not to do them reverence, but, apparently, they can not or will not fight the germ that laid those warriors low.

"The treaty of Sevres was soaked and saturated in hochpolitik of the most imperialistic nature; that the self-interest and wille zur macht exuded was skillfully camouflaged only makes things worse—has, in fact, put us a rung lower since 1914. It has turned the open power of princes into masquerade, with masks off with midnight arrived, but in one country so far—Russia.

"The particular form of camouflage resorted to in connection with the Near East may, perhaps, be summed up in the verb 'to protect.' Britain, France, and Italy were all desperately anxious to protect Greece and equally keen that some

one else should protect the one country really needing protection in the vicinity—Armenia. In the scramble to protect Hellas of classical form and beauty I imagine John Bull won—truth to tell, old Bull is a pastmaster at protection, though it is not quite clear at times what precise form his protection takes, whether he is protecting himself from his protegee, as in Egypt, or his protegee from himself, as in Ireland.

"At Sevres the Allies, of course, looked around for a principle upon which to reconstruct the Balkans and the Near East, a principle leaving that part of the world safe for democracy. France wanted a new Crimean war, Italy wanted every little island she sailed up to in the night, and England wanted some one to do police work for her in the neighborhood.

"As an example of the ruling mentality at Sevres and Constantinople I do not think I am transgressing the bounds of private conversation in relating one item Admiral Bristol, the American high commissioner, told me. He and three others were dispatched to Smyrna to report on what ought to be done with that supremely rich coastal strip. The small four reported to the big four that Smyrna could not be given to Greece on any principle whatever. Smyrna was given to Greece. It was given to Greece because the enlightened way of the world to-day is first to consider what raw material a place produces and, secondly, what human beings. That explains why nobody wants Armenia. In Smyrna you trip over figs and tobacco; in Armenia over the outraged bodies of women and children.

"The British policy won, though not without the bitter enmity of France and Italy being fired—an enmity which had to be cooled ever and anon with fresh offerings to these two champions of local liberty. The British policy was to create a great new Greece and to straddle her, with allied backing—moral, economic, and, if necessary, military—across the Balkan Peninsula and Asia Minor.

"I remember sailing along the coast of this new Greece for three days and three nights last summer from Corfu to Constantinople and pondering that the population of the revitalized colossus was considerably less than that of London. It gave one to think at the time; it set one wondering how long Venizelist Greece would last, surrounded, as she was, east and west and south and north by foes. Turkey had been carved up to satiate her; so, too, Bulgaria; Kemal was at war with her, and Italy hated her with a hate of fifty millions choking down.

"The new Greece was to act as an outpost of Britain and to do Britain's work. As a start off she was sent into Asia Minor against Kemal; a constant menace to the British in Mesopotamia—no menace at all to Constantinople. The Smyrna expedition was financed by interested Salonikan millionaires and by one semi-English millionaire. The six divisions sent across the Aegean coast in the vicinity of half a million dollars a day, and the Allies had to find some of this, since Greece was verging on bankruptcy, but the bulk of the money in this first venture at making things safe locally for democracy came from capitalist kings of the Levant. Everywhere one searches in this sorry story of grab-as-grab-can one encounters the same rabid negation of all the war was ostensibly fought for.

"Even between the Allies themselves mean subterfuge and intrigue were resorted to. Thus, the French, having commanded at Saloniki, and having possessed much Balkan prestige before the war, naturally claimed to be the paramount power, overlording the whole situation. This the British agreed to, and Gen. Franchet d'Esperey was installed as commander in chief of the allied forces. In the same document and, planissimo, Gen. Milne was granted the military command at Constantinople. The French did not see the catch in this. Constantinople, of course, is the whole country, one might say, the whole Near East, and soon Gen. Milne had completely sidetracked the Frenchman, ever after known as 'Desperate Franky.'

"Meanwhile the Italians went against everyone, aglow with just one notion—to improve the shining hour by opening up trade with all and sundry. They traded with the bolsheviks in the Black Sea, and they passed in arms and aeroplanes to Kemal up the Meander Valley, that these same arms might be employed against the new and hated Greece. For sheer futility and immorality you could not have beaten the Levant last August. Friends were betrayed and bloody hands grasped with a nonchalance unheard of. One day the British were throwing over their vital war friend Feisul in order to subscribe to Gen. Gouraud's Napoleonic behavior on Napoleonic ground of the long ago, and the next the poor, broken, and tattered Serbs, greatest and least sung of war victims, saw forever their vision of a window by the sea float by in order that Italy might be kept quiet and recompensed for losing the Dodecanese.

"Grab-as-grab-can!

"To the wayfarer with a pen it all seemed like some grim Frankenstein experiment, this bisecting and dissecting of mar-

tyred territory by foreign offices and foreign bankers, by men at the telephone and with Rolls Royces at the door. It filled one with great melancholy as you passed through the Dardanelles and saw hillside after hillside of Australian dead—23,000 men, who might have been alive to-day in a land of sun and laughter, and who had died for this!

"It seemed like the deliberate and cold-blooded reestablishment of the order that had dug those graves. French, British, and Italians—they were in it for what they could get out of it, and not to bring peace and good will to these lesser tribes of the Mediterranean. Their fine orations had been so many words on the wind; instead of the Kaiser riding through Jerusalem, it was to be King George or King Victor or King Somebody Else. They had remade the map with a scissors, like the three Emperors cut up Poland long ago. What rhyme or reason was there, for example, in bringing the Greeks right up to the threshold of Constantinople? Thrace may have been Greek before Christ, but so was Marseille. Journeying up to Adrianople, I saw no suggestion of any other land but Turkey. But diplomats do not have to explain why they do things, although not one in any sanely organized business concern but would get the sack for messing things up as the Entente statesmen have done in southern Europe and in Asia Minor.

"They are now, as I write, going to 'revise the treaty of Sevres in Turkey's favor.'

"This one phrase gives the true measure of the Allies' political honesty and Christian disinterestedness among Moslems and others. Their Greek policy having collapsed through a monkey bite, as a result of the Greeks calling for Constantine, whose return means the end of a pro-Entente Greece, the French, British, and Italians must now somehow arrange things between themselves, so that the unspeakable Turk is replaced in power. Well may Chicherin tilt his chair back in the Kremlin and smile at such prewar groping in a postwar world! An Irishman said to me the other day, 'I am gradually becoming a Sinn Feiner against my will through listening to the English talking about Ireland.' Who will say that millions are not becoming bolsheviks against their will through watching the allied statesmen steadily erecting the international structure which precipitated the war?

"The Allies want some nation in the Near East which will carry their banner while they rake in the shekels. They do not mind much who that person is, murderous Turk or greedy Levantine. As for clearing out of all territory where they don't belong, and are only installed as Prussians would install themselves; as for France giving back to Feisul what is Feisul's and tearing up a purely imaginary mandate, there is no more chance of that than there is of the Italians quitting Upper Cilicia—how they got there is a complete mystery—or of the British departing from Constantinople or from Bagdad. Somehow or other the Allies will find a formula enabling them to stay on \* \* \* rather than abandon their imperialistic and economic designs, they would, one verily believes, permit the Turks to protect the Viennese again, as in a bygone age.

"The French are for a new Turkey, with a view to using a new Turkish Army in the Caucasus against the bolsheviks, and so recovering their \$1,500,000,000 debt from Lenin; the British are in favor of a new Turkey because she may settle their troubles in Mesopotamia and lessen the growing enmity toward them in the Mahometan world; the Italians have all along been brazenly in favor of a new Turkey as the one means of keeping Greece from local domination. So up with the Turk and down with poor Hellas! \* \* \* Verily, the Allies, past masters at protecting, are not overkind to their past mistresses!

"If any man desires to behold the great principles of these last years carried from theory into practice, let him proceed to Constantinople and thence describe a circle of a thousand miles diameter. He will look out on a world of all the worst of human passions, of greed, hatred, and intrigue. He will behold a world in chaos, a world of anarchy and strife, in which each one is out for self, and self alone, while hiding his true intentions beneath tall talk; a world in which two eyes never meet two eyes, a world of deceit and grim trading across the corpses of the weak; a world of typhus and killing, while Mr. Lloyd-George and others of his kidney settle it all in between a round of golf and a foreign-office banquet.

"The four States of Transcaucasia—born of Versailles—Armenia, Kurdistan, Azerbaijan, and Georgia—are either non-existent or have passed to the bolsheviks; Anatolia, from Erzerum to Smyrna, is ruled by a Turkish rebel; Greece is undergoing a complete bouleversement with Italy, across the way, straining to spring at her throat; d'Annunzio is being subsidized by Rome in defiance of all and everybody; Austria and Serbia are slowly dying; and the red terror rules all around from Rumania to Baku.



"In the center of this charming postwar picture stand the Allies, 'revising the treaty of Sevres.' They might, to greater advantage, revise themselves."

Mr. President, I repeat I offer this article because it appears in the leading Democratic newspaper of the Nation, a newspaper which has been hard-and-fast administration and the chief advocate among the newspapers of the land of the League of Nations. I assume, appearing in this particular paper, that the newspaper itself lends verity to what its correspondent says.

In this connection one further word: This great newspaper is conducting to-day something of an agitation respecting disarmament. It has discovered, with all the joy of a youth first seeing a self-evident proposition, that war may be banished from the earth more nearly by disarmament than by any other agency or in any other manner. So it is conducting to-day, in the amazement and the pleasure of its new discovery, this particular campaign for disarmament. In that every man wishes it the utmost success, of course. We are all agreed, I take it, that if there is a real desire among the powers of the earth to prevent war they can prevent it by substantial disarmament; and if the five great nations of the earth, who constituted the five allied and associated powers in the World War, should meet together and decide upon reduction of armament, we would have taken the one great step that could be taken toward the promotion of peace and the prevention of all future wars. We all pray, of course, that that step may ultimately be taken, and we commend to some of those outside of the Chamber who have hysterically endeavored to direct our course during the past couple of years toward a new super-government, or who have sought consciously or unconsciously to embroil us in European controversies, quarrels, broils, and war—we commend to them the one great step that may be taken—substantial reduction of the armaments of the nations of the earth, for the prevention of wars in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is entitled to the floor.

#### THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I should like to have the privilege of introducing a resolution and speaking very briefly, not more than five minutes, upon the subject matter of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to call the attention of Senators to paragraph numbered 2 under "Morning business":

It shall not be in order to interrupt a Senator having the floor for the purpose of introducing any memorial, petition, report of a committee, resolution, or bill. It shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce this rule without any point of order hereunder being made by a Senator.

So the Chair will have to hold that the Senator from Mississippi can not yield for that purpose.

Mr. EDGE. If a request for unanimous consent is made and given, does the rule still hold?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules make it the duty of the Chair to enforce the rule.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey may be permitted—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that that can not be done; the Senator can not yield for that purpose.

Mr. HARRISON. Suppose I yield the floor and allow the Senator to proceed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator yields the floor, the Chair will recognize the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HARRISON. Then I am not estopped from gaining recognition after that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to speak twice on the same day on the motion.

Mr. HARRISON. I have not spoken yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Mississippi for giving me this opportunity. I send to the desk a resolution which I offer and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 413) was read, as follows:

Whereas the reconstruction of many countries after the World War is dependent largely on supplies of all kinds from the United States; and  
Whereas such supplies should be, and to a large extent must be, transported in United States merchant ships; and  
Whereas approximately \$4,000,000,000 of the American people's money, raised from them largely by taxation, has been invested in an American merchant marine; and

Whereas an accounting on this investment now is imperatively advisable, in order that the people through their Congress may frame definite policies and enact legislation for the stimulation and businesslike management of this merchant marine: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Shipping Board be, and it hereby is, instructed to submit to the Senate without loss of time a concise report, devoid of arguments, and intelligible to the average citizen, on the following points:

1. The total amount of moneys appropriated for, and otherwise provided for, the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the United States Shipping Board as its successor, from September 7, 1916, to and including November 30, 1920.
2. The gross profits or losses, as the case may be, for the same period.
3. The net profits or losses, as the case may be, for the same period.
4. The disposition of any net profits, if any such there have been.
5. The amount of capital on which the United States Shipping Board now is conducting its business.
6. The number of vessels at present owned by the Shipping Board, giving material of which each is constructed and tonnage of each.
7. The number of vessels, if any, at present owned in part by the Shipping Board, giving material of which each is constructed and tonnage.
8. Number and description of vessels owned by the Shipping Board now in operation under its sole management, and number and description under charter by the Shipping Board in operation under its sole management.
9. Number and individual and aggregate value of vessels owned by the Shipping Board now managed by it in conjunction with private interests.
10. Number of vessels owned by the Shipping Board now chartered by it to private interests and operated entirely by private interests.
11. Number and individual and aggregate values of vessels owned by the Shipping Board not at present in operation, giving (a) name and description and tonnage of each such vessel; (b) length of time it has not been in operation; (c) reason why it has not been and is not now in operation; (d) place where each such vessel is docked or tied up; (e) expense of daily maintenance of each such vessel; (f) percentage of each vessel's value lost monthly by such idleness; (g) estimated percentage of each such vessel's value lost monthly in depreciation.
12. Concise description of the system of accounting by which (a) the profits or losses of the Shipping Board are determined; (b) the loss by depreciation is estimated; (c) the individual profit or loss on each vessel, in operation or idle, is established.
13. Copy of any standard form of contract the Shipping Board may have established.
14. List of all contracts with private individuals or corporations operating Shipping Board vessels either by themselves entirely or in conjunction with the Shipping Board.
15. List of contracts now ready for conclusion with private interests for the operation of Shipping Board vessels, and list of tentative contracts now under consideration for future conclusion.
16. Number of persons now employed by the Shipping Board; (a) on shore, and (b) afloat.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator add to that resolution two other items—first, the value of the ships now owned by the Government, according to the market price; second, the number of ships sold, the amount received therefor, and the loss on those vessels?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I might add, for the benefit of the Senator from Utah, that I think that particular information is fairly well contained in a recent report issued by the Shipping Board.

My object in introducing the resolution is, briefly, this: I have tried as far as possible to dissect and analyze the recent report of the Shipping Board. I assume that it is absolutely correct—I have no reason, of course, to think otherwise—and perhaps it is in the usual form in which most of the departmental reports are issued; but I must frankly confess that I have been unable to secure this particular information, which I think of the utmost importance if Congress proposes to legislate in connection with this great responsibility.

I just want to point out, in the three minutes that I am going to consume, some important facts in this connection.

Some of you may perhaps know, but I doubt very much if the country appreciates, that the merchant marine to-day represents an investment of approximately four billions of dollars; and that four billions of dollars, estimating the average rate of interest, means a charge against the taxpayers of this country of almost a quarter of a billion per year, and, brought down to the monthly expense, approximately twenty millions per month and over \$650,000 per day. For every day of 24 hours there is charged up, at the average rate of interest, over \$650,000; and this is entirely apart from any loss in operation or loss in administration.

We discuss here, and very properly so—we have for years, and we undoubtedly will for many years to come—the Navy of the United States. I wonder if Senators really appreciate that, as proud as we are of the Navy, it does not represent to-day an inventory of three billions of dollars. The merchant marine investment at this moment represents 25 per cent more than the present estimated worth of the entire Navy and all the equipment of the Navy. So it does appeal to me very strongly that if there is an information we can get in order to devise businesslike plans for the future management of the merchant marine, or its disposition, it is our duty to have such information before us.

I was thoroughly and heartily in favor of the bill presented by the present Presiding Officer, the Jones bill, and I hope it

will have an opportunity to be worked out; but I think additional legislation is imperative if the information I get is correct, that prices for ships have not been materially reduced, and that in the case of those ships that have been sold over 12 firms that have paid high prices for them have already gone into the hands of receivers and can not operate them. It simply means that if we have a bad investment we must recognize it as business men and take a loss and write it off; and it is incumbent upon this Senate and this Congress to give very careful business consideration to an investment of that character, as stupendous as it is.

So I am going to ask unanimous consent of the Senate for the present consideration of the resolution in order that we may at least receive information that must be of benefit to every Senator in this body.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### EMERGENCY TARIFF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer to the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, it was rumored some time ago that the minority side of the Chamber intended to indulge in a filibuster to prevent any action upon the bill which is under consideration in the motion for reference. That, of course, they had a right to do under the procedure of the Senate, and I am not objecting at all to the method that they see fit to invoke in order to accomplish the result they desire to accomplish, if they think it can be better accomplished in that way.

My understanding was, of course, that that was to prevent the matter being passed upon until after the holidays. Of course, there is no necessity of any filibuster for that purpose, because it would be impossible for us to dispose of the subject until some time after the holidays; but inasmuch as the Senate is now indulging in the pleasurable pastime of a filibuster, we might as well understand to what extent the Senate feels that it is justified in so doing. In order to test that question, I move to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Mississippi for an interruption?

Mr. McCUMBER. For an inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has stated that there is a filibuster on.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has made two speeches. I have been yielding to various Senators, all of whom are on his side, for the past hour. There is no filibuster on. The only desire in the world that this side has, so far as I know, is to give some time for this bill to go to a committee. I had hoped that it would be held on the table until some of the Members who are on certain committees return from their Christmas holidays. It does seem to me that the Senator is all wrong—first, in charging that there is a filibuster, and, secondly, in making a motion to table a proposition when he knows that there are Senators here who desire to speak, after he has spoken twice on it.

If the Senator thinks that is fair, then he may go his way; but I do not think other Senators will think it is just the proper thing to do. He knows that I have been on my feet here, gaining recognition to say something on this bill. I yielded to the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] because a Senator on that side of the Chamber objected to allowing a certain pamphlet to be incorporated in the Record. I yielded to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] so that he might have his resolution introduced and agreed to. I have tried to be kind and patient with my colleagues here, and I find now that we are compensated by a motion to table, which shuts off debate, after the Senator himself has spoken twice.

Does the Senator insist on his motion to table?

Mr. McCUMBER. Oh, yes, Mr. President. I have no doubt of the kindly intention of the Senator to give all the time possible to delay the reference.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator does not take me at my word, then?

Mr. McCUMBER. I insist upon the motion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARRISON. A motion to table carries with it the whole proposition, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It carries the motion, and that is all.

Mr. HARRISON. It carries the motion where?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the table.

Mr. HARRISON. It puts it on the table, so that the whole proposition just lies on the table and does not go to a committee?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has yielded the floor.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question. The Senator said there was no disposition on the other side to hurry through the consideration of the bill, and indicated that the committee would not make a report on the bill until after the holidays. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly. It would be impossible for us to do it.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the reference is made to the Committee on Finance, no report will be made until after the holidays?

Mr. McCUMBER. No; we could not report it out until after the holidays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] moves to lay the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] on the table, and on that motion the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] asks for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], which I transfer to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and in his absence I am compelled to withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). On this vote I have been requested to pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DIAL], and I withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. Not knowing how he would vote, I will withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], which I transfer to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KENDRICK. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "yea."

Mr. EDGE. I am paired with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. KNOX. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote in favor of referring the bill to the Committee on Finance. Therefore I feel at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];



The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. GERRY. I have been requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] on account of illness.

The roll call resulted—yeas 33, nays 12, as follows:

#### YEAS—33.

Asburt	Gronna	La Follette	Pomerene
Beckham	Haie	Lenroot	Sheppard
Borah	Henderson	McLean	Smoot
Brandegee	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Townsend
Curtis	Kendrick	New	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Kenyon	Norris	
Elkins	Keyes	Page	
France	Knox	Polindexter	

#### NAYS—12.

Fletcher	Harrison	McKellar	Reed
Gerry	Hitchcock	Nugent	Stanley
Gore	King	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.

#### NOT VOTING—51.

Ball	Harding	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Harris	Owen	Spencer
Chamberlain	Hedlin	Penrose	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Phelan	Swanson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Philps	Thomas
Cummins	Kellogg	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Edge	Lodge	Sherman	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	McCormick	Shields	Warren
Fernald	McCumber	Simmons	Watson
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Gay	Myers	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Glass	Newberry	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion to lay on the table the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce the yeas are 33, the nays are 12. Senators present and not voting are the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHILPS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE]. A quorum is present and the motion prevails.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I move that the bill be referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, and in speaking to that motion I shall not occupy the Senate long.

Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] was laboring under a wrong impression when he thought that Senators on this side of the Senate were attempting a filibuster. It is the desire of some of the Members on this side to delay this matter until about Thursday, when certain members of the committee return to the city. These members of the committee went home to spend Christmas with their families, and they went expecting that the other side of the Chamber would be patient with them and not attempt to rush through legislation.

But they were mistaken. They did not give the question that degree of consideration, perhaps, that it deserved. They did not realize that the other side of the Chamber was drunk with political ambition to do that which its party had done 20 years ago; that it had misinterpreted the great vote it received in November of this year; that it was going back to the old days, when the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and Senators from Iowa and other Senators on the other side of the aisle saw fit to criticize their party and point out the dangers which lurk within such tactics.

But this piece of handiwork, handed to us by the body at the other end of the Capitol, is a loaded bombshell. It has been lighted there, and it is the duty of the majority of the Senate, in my opinion, to place its foot upon it and stamp it out before its explosion shall kill out the last ray of hope to the consuming masses of the country.

There never was such an iniquitous piece of legislation, perhaps, in the United States Congress. Talk about tariff—I can not understand how you high protectionists, such as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], can stomach such a measure as this.

I am not unmindful of the fact that when the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was debated in this Chamber, and afterwards con-

demned by the American people, even your President saying it was the most iniquitous tariff measure ever placed upon the statute books, you did not go as far as are written in the provisions of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will suspend for a moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. The bill (S. 3390) to provide for the national defense; to establish a self-sustaining Federal agency for the manufacture, production, and development of the products of atmospheric nitrogen for military, experimental, and other purposes; to provide research laboratories and experimental plants for the development of fixed-nitrogen products; and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRISON. In the beginning the Republican Party may have had some slight reason for asking protection on articles imported into this country. The industries in the East, it was said, needed some protection; but they have grown rich now. They no longer need it. That day has long passed. Our exports have increased by leaps and bounds. This last year, I believe, the balance of trade was something like \$3,000,000,000 in our favor. We are shipping wares and goods and products as never before to the countries of the world, and yet it is proposed in this measure to raise a tariff wall around the United States and say to those countries to which we are selling those goods, "While we want you to buy our goods, you shall not ship your goods into the United States."

Can any statesman blame Canada for retaliating against us if we place a tariff on wheat that comes from Canada into this country? Can we blame any country for erecting a wall that will bar our goods and wares and products into their land if we prevent theirs coming into ours? What say Senators from New England, whose factories and factory owners have grown rich by making goods and wares and shipping them to Canada and other countries? Are their constituents going to feel pleased over legislation that will take money out of their pockets and restrain them from making goods to furnish to the markets of the world?

Yet opposition heretofore to high protection has come, for the most part, from the representatives of the farming interests of the West and of the South. Those out there believed in some protection, but their farmers did not believe in an exorbitantly high protection nor an embargo. They did not believe in robbing the great masses of the people at the expense of a few. So it was the influence of the western Representatives and Senators and of the southern Representatives and Senators that prevented the avaricious hand of the interests of New England and the East from placing too high rates of taxation into the various schedules.

But they have offered in this bill a sop to the farmers of the West.

There are Representatives in the House whom I love, with whom I served, and whose voices have rung out in behalf of the people, who voted for this iniquitous piece of legislation. Some of them will want a very high protection during the coming Congress, so they can go back to the old days—these high-protection advocates, some of whom have said, "You can not get a tariff too high for me."

Do you know what they are doing in the bill to Senators from the West? This is a piece of gross deception they are handing to those who represent the farming interests, who have sat, like the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], on the Agricultural Committee and tried to evolve some plan that might help the great farming interests of the country; to Senators like the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], who has worked day after day trying to do something for the farmers of the country, and under whose leadership was passed in the Senate the bill reviving the War Finance Corporation. Why? It was because he thought the way to help them was to find markets abroad for our products and create a credit in this country to carry them over. If he had proposed, or if any Senator had proposed at that time when we were trying to do something real for the farmer, that the proper way to do it was to place a big tariff wall around the United States so that no other country could ship anything into the country, but continue to allow us to ship our goods and wares and products abroad, the Senate would have been amazed. It is unfair, Senators. It is wrong in principle for us to ask of some other nation to do for us what we are unwilling to do for others.

Yes; they tried to catch us in the South by placing cotton in the bill. Smart? I will hand it to you, Senators. You are very adroit, but you should not have started so soon after the recent election.

Did we hear anything of the tariff in the last campaign? No; it was not heard of. High cost of living was heard of. I

hold in my hand a pamphlet issued by the speakers' bureau of the Republican national committee that says, "Why 25-cent sugar?" Why press down upon the backs of the consuming masses of the country? That is what was given to the people then. The Republicans did not say then that we were going to revise the tariff and revise it so high that there would be a wall preventing goods and wares and products from other countries entering into our borders.

I wish I had the time—but if I should undertake it the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] would accuse me of filibustering—that I might read some of the things that were said in this pamphlet. Here is the way the pamphlet wound up. Splendid stuff, fine stuff, the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] says, to ask, "Why 25-cent sugar?" Here are some of the arguments. It says:

At 25 cents, the lowest price anywhere, the American people have been robbed of \$1,080,000,000.

One billion and eighty million dollars!

That is more than enough to pay the entire soldiers' bonus.

Now, Republicans were handing them sop. They wanted to make the soldier believe they were going to give him some kind of a bonus, but our committees have been working for days and days and have not come to any conclusion yet. That is why that was put in there.

This is more than enough to pay the entire soldiers' bonus which is so agitating the people of the Nation and which Congress is trying to find some way to grant.

Why, God bless you, a man with a mind such as that possessed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] could conceive of a good plan in a day. It would not take all this time to get some good plan for the soldiers' bonus.

By one fell act—

The pamphlet says—

the President and his Attorney General enabled the sugar growers of the world to enrich themselves by this fabulous sum of \$1,440,000,000.

And it closes by saying:

The poor, plundered citizen, struggling to feed and clothe his family, naturally complains of the high cost of living. But it is better to think than to complain.

And yet in this bill what are Republicans proposing to do? They are not robbing the consuming masses of \$1,440,000,000, as they allege on sugar alone, but it goes up into figures that I can not enumerate.

Talk about wheat coming in here from Canada. Yes; some wheat comes in and we ship very little abroad; but does the Senator from North Dakota forget that flour was away up at one time; that the poor people could not get it and could not have biscuits and bread on their tables? The millers of the country may get some benefit by your embargo, because they will take it as an excuse to raise the price of flour, but the farmer will not. And, after all, my friends, we have to look sometimes beyond the wheat grower. We have to look some to the consumers of the country. I can ride through my State and see the fields white with cotton on every hand, plantation after plantation. It is proposed to put a tax on that to help them. But I know it is a delusion and a snare; merely a bid for southern votes.

I would not vote for the proposition if 99 per cent of the people of Mississippi should ask me to do it, because I believe it is wrong in principle. That is why I am against it. It is wrong for a party to say they are trying to help the consumers of the country and lift a load from them, and at the same time try to gouge down their throats a bill that will increase the cost of living in the country.

Six months ago what was the cry in this Chamber? It was, "Let us reduce the high cost of living." The people of the country were hysterical about it. Yet now you are trying to increase the high cost of living to the consumers of the country. The proposition can not be denied. When an embargo is put on wheat, and on corn, and on live stock, and on those various things, it is increasing the burden on the consuming masses.

Mr. President, another peculiar thing about the bill is this: In the House there were no hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. It was forced down. The same tactics seem to be employed here. I do not know whether the Senate committee will have hearings or not. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] says that there will be. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] looks doubtful about the proposition. May I ask the Senator from Utah whether it is proposed to have any hearings on the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know what the committee will do. As far as I am concerned, I will say frankly to the Senator from Mississippi that I do not see any necessity for hearings.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought that was the Senator's position, and yet the Senator has stood on the floor of this Chamber, as well as other Senators, and cried out for a tariff commission—

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no!

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator has not, I will exclude him from that statement. Other Republicans have cried out for a tariff commission that might go into all the facts and study the questions and recommend to the Congress what to do. And yet they are not willing to ask in this instance any advice or to ask for any data from the Tariff Commission. It may be because of the personnel of it; I do not know; but certainly the committee ought to have some hearings on the proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRISON. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. As far as I am concerned, when an article comes into this country free of duty, and when the difference in exchange between the money of our country and that of the country from which that same product is to be shipped into our country reaches as high as 30 per cent, referring to England and Australia and South America, and up to 900 per cent with Germany, the American producers are not on an equal footing. Every pound of wool that is allowed shipped into the United States to-day is to the disadvantage of the American grower, because the foreign grower has an advantage of 30 per cent in exchange, and I think that any American farmer or grower of cattle or wool or anything else at least ought to be put on an equal footing with his foreign competitor, and that is what we are trying to do in part in the pending measure.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; the great trouble with the Senator from Utah is that he sees wool, wool, wool, and would pull it over some of our eyes. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. That may be easily accomplished, as the Senator from Mississippi says, but I do not think so. I will say to the Senator that I am a protectionist—not a spotted one; I am a reasonable protectionist. I am a protectionist for every industry in the United States no matter where it may be located. I favor placing our industries at least on an equal basis with foreign competitors. The Senator from Mississippi will not say to-day that the woolgrower or the wheat grower of the United States is on an equal footing with the foreign wheat grower and the foreign woolgrower.

Mr. HARRISON. I have never accused the Senator from Utah of being a "spotted" protectionist. I think if there ever was a protectionist all over it is the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I desire to be.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Utah is as strong and as high a protectionist as I know of in the country. I do not like spotted protectionists; neither have I any respect for a peanut protectionist. I have no respect for a Democrat who will vote for protection on something which is grown in his district and at the same time expend his eloquence against the principle of protection. I stand to-day where I have always stood and the way my party has stood against any protection of any kind.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is consistent in that position, and I respect him for it, but in his remarks he referred to the fact that I only had wool in sight all the time.

Mr. HARRISON. That was facetious.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well; that is all right. Then I have nothing more to say.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; that was facetious.

Mr. President, I am coming back to sugar for a moment. The pamphlet from which I have quoted is a remarkable one. Twenty-five cent sugar! Sugar to-day, I think, is around 8 or 9 cents, or something like that.

Mr. SMOOT. It is less than that, I will say to the Senator; and if there is not a change in the price of sugar the Senator from Mississippi will have the satisfaction of seeing half the beet-sugar factories of the West in financial trouble. Let me tell the Senator what has happened. I think the sugar-beet producer is about the only farmer in the United States who this year has had such an advantage as I am about to relate. The beet-sugar factories of the West made a contract with the beet growers for the raising of beets for the year 1920 under which the minimum price of the beets was to be \$12 a ton, and for every dollar the sugar sold above \$12 a ton the farmer was to receive \$1 more per ton for his beets. The fact of the matter now is that the farmers have been paid \$12 a ton for their beets while the sugar factories of the intermountain country—I refer to them, I will say, because I know of their situation—still have on hand 95 per cent of all of the sugar manufactured from those beets. The Food Administration said that \$10 beets justified \$11 sugar, but grant that it means but \$10 sugar and see what is happening to the beet-sugar producer. To-day the price of beet sugar is about 7½ cents a pound. The factories have paid \$12 a ton for all of their beets; and I wish now to say to the Senator as to the beet-sugar industry of this country—and I think the cane-sugar industry of Louisiana is about in the same position, although I do not know so much about that as I do about the other



industry—that if there is any satisfaction in seeing the beet-sugar factories financially crippled and many ruined, such a condition will shortly occur unless there is an increase in the price of sugar.

Mr. HARRISON. I shall have no satisfaction in seeing that; I shall get no satisfaction out of it.

Mr. SMOOT. I hoped the Senator would not.

Mr. HARRISON. I am merely talking about Republican hypocrisy in crying out against 25-cent sugar in the campaign while now they are trying to impose still greater burdens on the consuming masses.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Mississippi knows the answer to that suggestion. If the President had acted when he ought to have acted in relation to the Cuban sugar, the sugar industries of this country would not be in the shape in which they are to-day. I stated upon the floor of the Senate that I did not wish to see the price of sugar advance in the way it did, and I know that the sugar manufacturers of the United States did not wish to see it do so, but the situation is precisely as I have explained in relation to the contracts which have been made for this year. They now find themselves, I am sorry to say, about where I expected they would, although I never thought that sugar would go from its high price down to 7½ cents per pound wholesale.

I know that if there can be any relief given by way of tariff to save these industries, perhaps it would be well enough to insert sugar in the pending bill; but I am not asking for that, because I know very well that if the bill is changed from the shape in which it has passed the other House it is not going to pass Congress; in fact, I do not believe that the Senator from Mississippi thinks it will pass anyway during this short session.

Mr. HARRISON. I am afraid it will pass. If the Senator from Utah could say that it would not pass, it would prevent a great deal of worry upon the part of certain Members of the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Unless there is developed upon the other side a filibuster against the bill, it is going to pass; I will say to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator from Utah, of course, could not speak without taking a fling at the President of the United States on the sugar proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. HARRISON. I myself know something about the sugar question. I was a member of the Agricultural Committee, and I had several conferences with the Senator from Utah about the matter. We reported a bill out of the Agricultural Committee which gave the President the right to buy the Cuban crop of sugar, and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], and myself, day after day, would rise here and ask that the bill be taken up for consideration. For six weeks, I think it was, the bill was held back and we could not get the legislation passed until it was too late. The Senator from Utah knows that is true.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I know that the Senator recites the history of the bill; but the Senator also knows that the President had absolute power under then existing law to have purchased the Cuban crop.

Mr. HARRISON. But the President then stated—and the Senator from Utah knows that he did so—that unless the law could be extended for a year he should not feel justified in buying that crop of Cuban sugar. We afterwards gave to him the authority to extend the time.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that every member but one of the Sugar Equalization Board recommended that the President buy the Cuban sugar crop; and there was only one member of the board who told the President that he thought sugar would be lower in price and not to purchase it, and the President took his advice.

Mr. HARRISON. And he was entirely wrong.

Mr. SMOOT. And it was for that reason the President of the United States did not buy the Cuban sugar crop.

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; and Congress finally came around to the President's way of thinking and passed the law which he said he desired passed, but it took us a long time to do it.

Now, if the Senator is so solicitous about the welfare of the cane and beet sugar producers, as certainly his Republican colleagues in the other House are, why is it that some provision regarding sugar was not put into this bill?

I will tell the reason why they did not put some provision into the bill about sugar, and I do not suppose that there is any question about it. If I lived in Louisiana, I presume, politically I should last about a day, for they would fire me pretty quickly; but the reason why sugar was not placed in the bill was because the Republicans knew they had made a cry in the campaign against 25-cent sugar, and that that cry would rise

to face them and they would be accused of blowing hot and cold at the same time. There is more reason for placing sugar in the bill if it is proposed to try to do something for some of the farmers than for placing some other articles in the bill which are embraced in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, the Senator may put whatever construction he desires to place upon the action taken by the other House, but I am quite sure that he is mistaken in that conclusion.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope I am.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure of it. I desire to say to the Senator that there has not been a day since this emergency tariff bill has been under consideration that I have not received almost hundreds of letters from various parts of the United States asking that certain items be included in the bill; but I recognize the fact that there is no need of trying to pass emergency tariff legislation at this short session unless it covers merely commodities produced by industries which as a whole are in a condition of imminent danger.

Mr. President, that is all there is to this whole matter, as I see it, although I am frank to admit to the Senator that there are one or two articles covered by this bill which are not in imminent danger although, perhaps, they are making no money.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator thinks unless this bill is passed exactly as it came from the House, as I understand, that there will be no legislation on this subject, and, therefore, his position on the committee is going to be against incorporating other commodities, even though the industries producing them may be suffering greater than the industries producing articles already covered by the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I can not agree to the latter statement, for I do not think there are any other industries that are suffering more than those producing the articles covered by the bill, with one or two exceptions, as I have already stated.

Mr. HARRISON. What are those exceptions?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not wish to go into the question at this time as to exceptions. If when the bill is before the Senate for consideration the question comes up for discussion, then I shall be perfectly willing to express my opinion.

Mr. HARRISON. Take, for instance, corn, which is covered by the bill. Practically an embargo is placed upon corn, and yet there is not as much corn coming into this country as is raised in one county, say, in Illinois. The Senator, however, would leave corn in and not incorporate some other commodity, such as sugar. It may be that that is the reason why the Senator answered as he did my question about frozen meats awhile ago. We talk about cattle and sheep and other live stock, and yet there is nothing in this bill that prevents the five packers, if you please, from bringing all the frozen meats in here that they desire. In the absence of any suggestion from the Senator, I take it that my assertion is right.

Mr. President, this is a nefarious proposition; it is all wrong in principle; and it will place a heavy burden upon the toiling masses. I am against it. I hope that the committee will have full hearings, bring witnesses before it; and if there are some other industries suffering more than those producing the articles covered by the bill I hope the committee will hear their representatives and then, in the end, kill the whole proposal.

If the farmers and the representatives of farmers on this floor vote for this proposed legislation, their mouths are going to be closed in the extra session of Congress; they will then be unable to fight the nefarious high protective provisions as to some other commodities which will be placed in the bill which will be forthcoming at that time. If my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], with whom I served so long in the House, and who employed his splendid talents there for such a long time attempting to lift the burden from the consuming masses, shall vote for this bill, he will never be able to attack the proposed tariff legislation which will come at the next session as his distinguished colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] attacked the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill. If my friend, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], and his colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], too, should vote for this measure, they will not be able to give to the country the benefit of their magnificent ability in opposing the outrageous provisions that some of the conscienceless high protectionists will place in the bill coming on in the extra session. The junior Senator from Iowa was not here in the Senate when the Payne-Aldrich law was passed.

If he had been here, I have no doubt what would have been his course. He would have followed the course pursued by his distinguished and illustrious predecessor, Mr. Dolliver, than whom a more brilliant and able Senator never served in this body, who fought the iniquitous tariff law and tried to reduce the high protection rates which the Senator from Utah [Mr.

SMOOT], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], and the then Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, tried to place in that bill. It would be pitiful, indeed, to see Senators on the other side of the Chamber who have talked for progress, who have stood for progressive legislation, who have voted against the high protectionist and his methods, attack reactionary legislation in all its forms, vote for this bill and thereby estop themselves from making the gallant fight which otherwise they would make in the coming session.

I presume the Senate will vote down my motion to send the bill to the Interstate Commerce Committee, and then, I presume, they are going to send the bill to the Finance Committee; but let me plead with the Senator from Utah, when the bill gets before his committee, to give all those interested a fair hearing. While the Senator from Utah may see wool sometimes and may see live stock at other times, and may see various other articles at other times, that are covered by this bill, let us not forget the consumers of this country who have been so mercilessly and badly treated during the war because of the high costs of living they had to bear. Let us keep them in mind a little bit, and not make the protection too great.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator does not for a moment think that it is possible to have a complete revision of the tariff during the short session of Congress, or even to add to the commodities covered by the pending bill to any great extent and to secure its passage at this session?

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator would take my advice—I do not think he will, but if he should—he would table this measure as soon as it gets to the Finance Committee and would say, "Now, boys, let us get from the Tariff Commission a report on all these matters, as we said we were going to do, and let us frame a reasonable and fair tariff measure for presentation at the extra session of Congress."

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think there will be any rates in the proposed new tariff law which the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin will not be able to support.

Mr. HARRISON. Not if they vote for the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; there is quite a difference between the passing of an emergency tariff bill to meet a serious temporary situation that confronts certain producers in this country and passing a bill to remain on the statute books from year to year. I would not vote for some of the rates proposed in the pending measure in a regular tariff bill, I will say frankly to the Senator.

Mr. HARRISON. If I should vote for the pending measure, or any other Senator on this floor should do so—and I hope there will not be one—the Senator from Utah would cite the fact four hundred and ninety thousand times during the consideration of the new tariff bill in the next session. The 41 Representatives who voted for it on the Democratic side over yonder never will hear the last of it.

Mr. BORAH. On either side.

Mr. HARRISON. "On either side" is well put. So, Mr. President, I submit my motion, and, if the Senator will take my advice, it will work in the interest of the people and not a favored few.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment.

I voted against the motion of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to table the motion offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I thought his motion was premature, untimely, and unfair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and other Senators who might desire to discuss the question that was then before the Senate. The question was one which was the subject of legitimate debate, and I deemed it unwise and unfair to cut off opportunity for discussion. But upon the question of reference I intended to and shall vote to refer this bill to the proper and appropriate committee, the Committee on Finance.

During my short period of service in the Senate I have insisted upon the rules of the Senate with respect to committees and their functions and their prerogatives being respected. I am willing to take advantage of situations created or resulting from the rules of this body that will make for the advancement of my party and the country, and I have no regrets in so doing even though it may punish my Republican friends; but when it comes to the question of an observance of the rules of the Senate and of orderly procedure, I do not believe that my party will gain anything or the country derive any benefit by disregarding them. It will be the basis of claims that partisanship or a desire to "play politics" determines and inspires our conduct. In making this observation I am not referring to any particular matter. I am not criticizing those who may believe this measure should be referred to the Commerce Committee. There is much merit in the contention of the Senator from

Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], but it seems very clear to me that it should go to another committee.

I am opposed to this bill being referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce or to any other committee except the one to which, under the rules of the Senate, it should properly go; and I shall therefore vote to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to send this bill to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I made it out of deference to my distinguished friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. It was the only way in which I could express myself.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then, I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRISON. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and vote "yea."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before as to the transfer of my pair, I vote "yea."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "yea." Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent from the Chamber. In his absence, and being unable to secure a transfer of my pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. PHIPPS (when his name was called). Again announcing my pair, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I am advised that his vote on this motion would be the same as my own. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], but I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I accordingly vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KELLOGG. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. I understand that if he were here he would vote as I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer the general pair I have with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], and vote "yea."

Mr. EDGE. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], and vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL];

The Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON];

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD];

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS];



The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]; and

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The roll call was concluded; and the result was announced—yeas 47, nays 0, as follows:

## YEAS—47.

Ashurst	Gronna	Lenroot	Ransdell
Beckham	Hale	McKellar	Reed
Borah	Henderson	McLean	Sheppard
Brandegee	Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Myers	Smoot
Culberson	Kellogg	Nelson	Stanley
Curtis	Kendrick	New	Sterling
Dillingham	Kenyon	Norris	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Nugent	Townsend
Fletcher	King	Page	Wadsworth
France	Knox	Polindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	La Follette	Pomerene	

## NOT VOTING—49.

Ball	Harding	Overman	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Owen	Swanson
Chamberlain	Harrison	Penrose	Thomas
Colt	Heflin	Phelan	Trammell
Cummins	Hitchcock	Phipps	Underwood
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Sherman	Watson
Fernald	Lodge	Shields	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Simmons	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Smith, Ariz.	
Gerry	Moses	Smith, Md.	
Glass	Newberry	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this motion the yeas are 47, and the nays are none. Messrs. McCUMBER, PHIPPS, and EDGE being present and not voting. The motion prevails and the bill is referred to the Committee on Finance.

## ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next at 12 o'clock.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, ordinarily I should have no objection to this motion being made and carried; but I am reminded of some matters which have occurred in the Senate during the last 10 days, or such a matter, which I think ought to be given some consideration.

I remember a few days ago, when two or three Senators were pressing special bills which they wished to have considered, that the distinguished leader on the Democratic side insisted that one particular bill must be given consideration. He acknowledged that the Republican side, as he said, was responsible for legislation, and that the Democratic membership were not going to put any obstacles in the way, but he gave us due notice that that bill must be considered. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] had a measure which he wished to have given the right of way—

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the motion to adjourn is not debatable.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it is.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It is a motion to adjourn to a day certain.

Mr. FLETCHER. That motion is not debatable either, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the point of order is well taken. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. EDGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). Announcing my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair as before and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. KENDRICK (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer, I vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as before, I withhold my vote, not being able to secure a transfer. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of Montana (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. TRAMMELL] is unavoidably absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT].

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I again announce my pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and withhold my vote.

Mr. POMERENE. A moment ago I announced my pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I understand there is no objection to my voting on this motion, and I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LONGE], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS], and vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 29, nays 16, as follows:

## YEAS—29.

Beckham	Gerry	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	Gronna	New	Smoot
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Henderson	Page	Wadsworth
Curtis	Kendrick	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Elkins	King	Pomerene	
Fletcher	Knox	Ransdell	
France	McLean	Reed	

## NAYS—16.

Borah	Kenyon	McKellar	Polindexter
Hale	Keyes	McNary	Sheppard
Johnson, Calif.	La Follette	Nelson	Stanley
Jones, Wash.	Lenroot	Nugent	Townsend

## NOT VOTING—51.

Ashurst	Glass	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Gore	Newberry	Spencer
Calder	Harding	Overman	Sterling
Chamberlain	Harris	Owen	Swanson
Colt	Heflin	Penrose	Thomas
Cummins	Hitchcock	Phelan	Trammell
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Underwood
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Walsh, Mass.
Edge	Kellogg	Sherman	Warren
Fall	Kirby	Shields	Watson
Fernald	Lodge	Simmons	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gay	McCumber	Smith, Md.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] the yeas are 29 and the nays are 16, the following Senators present and not voting: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. There is a quorum present and the motion prevails.

The Senate thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Thursday, December 30, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, December 27, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy name. We bless Thee that Thou hast permitted us to pass through another Christmas day with its hallowed associations, sacred memories, and far-flung promises; for Thy love reflected in a thousand warm, sympathetic, generous hearts who fed the hungry, clothed the naked, and gave shelter to the homeless; blessings be upon their devoted heads, and long may their memory live to inspire millions yet unborn. Let Thy blessings descend copiously upon each Member of this House and their respective families, imbue them with heavenly gifts that they may solve the problems confronting them to the good of the Republic. Grant that each American citizen may hold up their hands and wait patiently until we reach the normal that we may be an example to all our sister nations under the divine leadership of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, December 23, 1920, was read and approved.